

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

ZACHARY D. HARDIE-BRAZILLE,

Plaintiff,

v.

LANE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE, et
al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 6:25-cv00670-AN

ORDER

NELSON, District Judge.

Plaintiff filed this civil rights case on April 24, 2025, and completed his *in forma pauperis* application on July 3, 2025. In the meantime, he has filed almost 20 motions in which he seeks to add claims and/or parties to this case, asks the Court to enter a preliminary injunction and/or summary judgment against Defendants, and seeks release from custody. No Defendant has been served, waived service, or made an appearance, and Plaintiff's motions are generally premature, moot, or meritless.¹ All motions are denied. Plaintiff may, however, file an amended

¹ Plaintiff appears to challenge the legality of his criminal prosecution and resulting confinement in this civil rights case. The Supreme Court has determined that "a state prisoner's § 1983 action is barred (absent prior invalidation)—no matter the relief sought (damages or equitable relief), no matter the target of the prisoner's suit (state conduct leading to conviction or internal prison

complaint which: (1) names all Defendants in its caption; (2) describes how each named Defendant personally participated in the deprivation of a federal right; (3) does not incorporate any prior document by reference; (4) contains a short, plain statement of his claim(s) consistent with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8; and (5) is on the form provided by the Court.

CONCLUSION

Plaintiff's pending Motions (#5, #6, #12, #13, #17, #19, #25, #26, #27, #30, #33, #34, #37, #40, #41, #42, #43, #50, and #55) are summarily denied. He may, however, file an amended complaint within 30 days that complies with the terms of this Order. Should he decline to do so, the case will proceed on his original Complaint (#1).

The Clerk of Court is directed to provide a civil rights complaint form to Plaintiff for his use.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

7/14/2025

DATE



Adrienne Nelson
United States District Judge

proceedings)—*if* success in that action would necessarily demonstrate the invalidity of confinement or its duration.” *Wilkinson v. Dotson*, 544 U.S. 74, 81-82 (2005) (italics in original).